

REMARKS

Applicant noted an error in the Abstract wherein the video stream represents the moving picture, not the graphics stream.

Additionally, there are proposed minor editorial changes noted in the respective claims such as utilizing the terminology “comprising” instead of “including” in Claim 17.

In Claim 33 we propose clarifying that it is the application data that is recorded on the recording medium and not “generated” data.

Claim 25 has a typographical error where “decode” should be --decoder--.

Claims 17, 25, 33 and 35 have been amended to provide “a moving picture ~~made of a plurality of pictures~~” consistent with our video stream example of the type stored on a BD ROM to provide data of a movie picture as defined, for example, in the Abstract and Paragraphs [0279] and [0065] (US 2007/0057969) and as further defined throughout our specification when referring to embodiments of streaming data.

Accordingly, Applicant has requested, without introducing new matter, the amendment of the independent claims to define “moving picture” and deleting --made of a plurality of pictures--.

Claim 35 is a reproduction method that is being requested to be amended consistent with the allowed subject matter of Claim 25 which requests a reproduction apparatus. Applicant inadvertently in the Amendment of July 25, 2008 failed to delete from Claim 35 the term:

--each being a group of data that constitutes graphics for one
screen --

when referring to “the graphics stream includes”.

Claim 35 had been amended in July 25, 2008 to delete --a plurality of-- and to add “one or more” when referring to “Display Sets”.

This same amendment was also entered in Claim 25 (reproduction apparatus), Claim 17 (recording medium), Claim 33 (recording method), Claim 34 (computer program stored on computer readable medium) and Claim 36 (an integrated circuit).

Additionally, these same claims 25, 17, 33, 34, and 36, however, also deleted --each being a group of data that constitutes graphics for one screen--.


Applicant wants to Claim 35 to be consistent with the other independent claims to rectify this omission in the Amendment of July 25, 2008. This proposed amendment of Claim 35 does not alter the definition of allowed subject matter nor does it broaden the current scope of allowed subject matter as represented by the other independent claims of record.

It is believed that the proposed amendments do not add any new matter, nor alter the scope of the invention in accordance with 37 CFR §1.312. Applicant requests that the proposed amendments be entered jointly and/or separately to address the above concerns.

If there are any questions with regards to this matter, the undersigned attorney can be contacted at the below listed number.

Very truly yours,

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.



Joseph W. Price
Registration No. 25,124
600 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400
Costa Mesa, California 92626-7689
Telephone: (714) 427-7420
Facsimile: (714) 427-7799